



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

progress. It is, therefore, my earnest desire, for the good of all, that the pedagogy of modern languages shall—within due limits and on a worthy plane—hold a larger place than heretofore in the Association itself and in the columns of MOD. LANG. NOTES. This movement forward we hope will be begun at the meeting in Washington.

As the topic for discussion on that occasion in the pedagogical department, I propose the paper read last year in Nashville by Mr. E. H. BABBITT, on: "How to use Modern Languages as a Means of Mental Discipline." To those who heard or have read this paper, I need not speak of its extraordinary interest. Whatever may be thought of the positions taken by the writer, yet the wide range and at the same time the condensation of his argument, his sharp and clear-cut views and the boldness with which they are maintained, make the paper peculiarly stimulating and suggestive. The same boldness and clearness of utterance, along with the very decided views presented on some important points, fit the paper especially for review and discussion. It will be remembered that such was the impression produced when it was read. But unfortunately this was during the last moments of the session, and though debate was eagerly desired it had to be cut short, almost without a word. Prof. ALCÉE FORTIER (then in the chair) and Prof. A. N. VAN DAELL, both of whom expressed a desire which could not then be accorded to speak on the subject, have been invited to open the discussion. Prof. BABBITT, I doubt not, will be ready to fight his own battles, and I am sure both sides will find eager allies and interested listeners. I trust that the paper thus offered for special discussion will in the meantime receive renewed reading and consideration on the part of the members of the Association; for, as I take it, we all belong to the pedagogical department. Whatever we may be as scholars, we are—or ought to be—first of all, *teachers*.

I will not anticipate a discussion which I hope may be of general interest, yet I will make a single remark. It is a question, it seems to me, not of an ideal pedagogy for ideal students under ideal conditions, but how we may best accomplish what is most essential for

the greatest body of our students, in our several spheres of school, college, and university. The main question seems to be, what is most essential; and then, what may be practicable, under our respective conditions, so as to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number. To these chief considerations the details of method, it seems to me, should be held quite subordinate—or, indeed, should be mainly determined by them. With this suggestion, I beg leave to commend the subject of Prof. BABBITT's paper for our thoughtful discussion in Washington.

EDWARD S. JOYNES.

South Carolina College.

THE PRONUNCIATION OF THE GERMAN STAGE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES :

SIRS:—In vol. vi, no. 6, of MOD. LANG. NOTES. you have reprinted the rules of the Royal Prussian theatres as to the pronunciation of *g*. It appears, therefore, that these rules were correctly reported by the newspapers from which VIETOR reprinted them in *Phonet. Stud.* i, p. 92. I should like here to call attention again to VIETOR's opinion that the Count VON HOCHBERG's description is unscientific, and also to the fact that the Count himself makes no claim that it is scientific, and that he only aimed at uniformity. "Ein leicht anschlagender guttural laut" that lies between *ch* and *k* is a phonetic chimera which no assurances of his Excellency, given to Professor HEWETT, can make a reality. An appeal to such an authority will carry no weight against a phonetician of VIETOR's reputation who says, "on the stage and in artistic song there still predominates the stop—except in *-ig-* both medially and finally (*tage, ták*)."¹ Count VON HOCHBERG wrote to VIETOR that he had not aimed at deciding a scientific question by this regulation, but had caused it to be printed solely to bring about a uniform pronunciation of the letter in question upon the Royal stage of Berlin.¹ It does not at all follow, therefore, that the actors under his control can and actually do pronounce that letter in the manner

¹ See *Phonet. Studien* i, p. 93.

which he so unscientifically prescribes. Nor is "Behagel," as Professor HEWETT calls him, any authority in Phonetics. His 'Deutsche Sprache' quoted by Professor HEWETT is a popular treatise für *Gebildete*.

Here I must put in two disclaimers:

1. My statement that there is a uniform stage pronunciation is not so bald and positive as Prof. HEWETT would seem to make out. It is made in the following words:²

"The only institution that claims to have a standard and tries to come up to it is the stage. The best theatres of Germany and the better actors, followed by a very small number of the cultured, strive after a dialect-free pronunciation."

This was written before BEHAGHEL wrote:

"Auf einem Gebiete nämlich hat das Bedürfnis schon jetzt zu einer Einigung auch in der Aussprache geführt: das ist das deutsche Theater (freilich zu keiner unbedingten)."

I did not say, that there is an absolute uniformity.

2. Final *g* as a surd stop is not, in my opinion, the *alleinseigmachende* pronunciation and is not so represented in the fourth edition of my grammar which Prof. HEWETT reviewed. To forestall this charge, I have put in the new (fifth) edition a reference to the Preface in §391,2.³

As to *g* being actually the corresponding surd stop, I must again assert, that I know this from actual observation of the better actors of the best theatres in Germany made during a stay there of a year and a half (1882-1883). I was in the theatres of the cities which Prof. HEWETT mentions except those of Zürich, which is not German, and in those of Frankfurt. I am well acquainted with the theatres of Strasburg and Hanover and I was born near the latter city. I tried during the period just named to make my observations as carefully and accurately as I knew how to make them. If the result differs from that noted by Professor HEWETT I regret it very much. This is in truth a question of fact, and a subject of inquiry. We might hear the same actor on the same evening and might not agree as to

whether he used sonant stop, surd stop or surd continuant. I certainly should not ask the actor what he pronounced, nor his "Chef"; neither should I take for granted that the actor of the Royal theatre pronounces what a "Chef," innocent of Phonetics, prescribes. All good theatres are not Royal Prussian, or even Court theatres in which a favorite nobleman often plays the tyrant. For several years past I have heard this very pronunciation by the imported "stars" at Amberg's in New York, and only lately I observed the same in the well-known reader and declaimer HERMANN RIOTTE.

In conclusion allow me to call attention to the fact, not always fully appreciated even by philologists, that a standard language and a standard pronunciation are used by very, very small minorities who have little influence on the language and pronunciation of the people. If I have observed correctly that final *g* is the surd stop, it does not follow that it will continue to be standard and will be finally adopted by the majority. This *g* is "caviare to the general"; the million will have none of it, nor will they accept this "What is it"? of the Berlin "Chef," this inconsistent, illogical, indefensible *g* (sonant stop), if that is what the regulation requires. The only sound acceptable to them is the spirant; namely, the guttural continuant of *ach* and the palatal continuant of *ich*, and it is already recognized in the suffix *-ig* in Berlin and in Munich.⁴ BENEDIX, quoted above by Prof. HEWETT, advocates the pronunciation of *g* as a spirant everywhere. VIETOR says, that the spirant for the stop in the suffix *-ig* is already recognized on the stage. That it will become standard before very long is, in my opinion, quite certain. The question then will be: In what positions shall it be recognized as standard? Will the interchange (*wechsel*) be between *g* (=sonant stop) and *kh*, *jh* (=surd spirants); or between *gh*, *j* (=sonant spirants) and *kh*, *jh*? Will it be elegant to say *tâge-tâkh* (spelt *tage-tag*), *lîge-lîjht* (spelt *liege-liegt*), or *tâghe-tâkh*, *lîje-lîjht*? It may be a personal prejudice with me, but I believe the interchange will be *tâge-tâkh*. When this has been decided I will write the obituary of *g*

² Cf. § 391 of my grammar.

³ The preface to the fifth edition is that of the fourth with only one word changed.

⁴ See OBERLÄNDER'S 'Übungen zur Erlernung einer dialektfreien Aussprache.' München, 1890.

interchanging with *k*, but as long as I hear the "elect" say *tāge-tāk*, I shall hold it up to my students as the ideal pronunciation.

H. C. G. BRANDT.

Hamilton College.

JUDAISM IN THE WEST IN THE SEVENTH CENTURY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In my article on "Old English Literature and Jewish Learning," published in MOD. LANG. NOTES for March 1891 (vi, pp. 77-78), and again in my paper on "The Name Cædmon" (*Publications of the MOD. LANG. ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA*, Vol. vi, No. 1), I collected certain items of evidence tending to show that the Jews, their language and their doctrines, were not so completely unknown in the West during the Old English period as has been sometimes supposed. I have since chanced upon another testimony to the same effect, less cogent, because of a later date, but not likely to have been a pure fabrication. I find it in TODD'S 'St. Patrick,' p. 108, where it is quoted from the Abbess HILDEGARDIS' Life of St. Disibod, or Disen, abbot of Disenberg, in the diocese of Mayence. HILDEGARDIS lived near the close of the twelfth century, but the state of things she describes must be assigned, according to TODD, to the year 620, or thereabouts:—

"At the time when the holy man was thus governing his people with words and examples, a huge schism and great scandals prevailed in all that country (i. e. Ireland). Some rejected the Old and New Testament, and denied Christ; others embraced heresies; very many went over to Judaism; some relapsed into paganism."

To quote TODD'S note at the foot of p. 109: "The original words are: 'Plerisque ad Judaismum se conferentibus.'"

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF ENGLISH *tote*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—The etymology of this interesting word, suggested by Prof. BASKERVILL in the June number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, (vi, pp.

180-181) seems like a very good guess. It seems possible from the meaning of a word 'tooters' which, we are told, signified in the sixteenth century persons who were wont 'to hunt out customers on the road.' But is this suggested etymology any more than a guess? It is certainly remarkable that Prof. BASKERVILL does not even attempt to account for the form of the word. O. E. *tōtian*, M. E. *tōten*, by the laws of change, would give present English *tūt* (London Eng. *tāwt*) which would be spelled in the sixteenth century *toot*, and at the present time *toot* or *tout*. Moreover, the original word has remained to the present time in its meaning of 'to ply or seek for customers' (cf. WEBSTER'S 'International Dic.' *tout*, *toot*; WRIGHT'S 'Provincial Vocab.' *toot*, *tout*). It also occurs in the noun form *touters* in DICKENS:

"The posy of ring droppers, . . . duffers, *touters*, or any of those bloodless sharpers who are, perhaps, better known to the police."

Of course Prof. BASKERVILL knows all this, but it serves to emphasize the point that O. E. *tōtian*, M. E. *tōten*, has come down to us in the phonetic form it should have according to the laws of change. If English 'tote' to carry, is derived from the same word, the essential thing to do is to show how this exceptional form came to exist, and until this is done the etymology is wholly hypothetical.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

Cornell University.

Wove (for *waved*), *dove* (for *dived*).

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—I should like to ask those interested in the survival of older forms, whether *wove* (for *waved*) is common. In New Brunswick a man said not long since, "I *wove* my hand to you": and a few days ago a preacher in Boston spoke of "how the palm trees *wove*."

In what part of North America is the form *dove* (for *dived*) very common, as it is here in New Brunswick?

W. F. STOCKLEY.

University of New Brunswick, Fredericton.

CHAUCER'S PROLOGUE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LONG. NOTES:

SIRS:—It should be stated that ZUPITZA